

KRISTIN K. MAYES  
Attorney General of Arizona  
(Firm State Bar No. 14000)  
John Raymond Dillon IV (AZ Bar No. 036796)  
Sarah Pelton (AZ Bar No. 039633)  
Dylan Jones (AZ Bar No. 034185)  
Laura Dilweg (AZ Bar No. 036066)  
Alyse Meislik (AZ No. 024052)  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Office of the Arizona Attorney General  
2005 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
Phone: (602) 542-3725  
Fax: (602) 542-4377  
[consumer@azag.gov](mailto:consumer@azag.gov)  
*Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

State of Arizona, *ex rel.* Kristin K. Mayes,  
Attorney General; et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Michael D. Lansky, L.L.C., dba Avid Telecom;  
et al.,

Defendants.

NO. CV-23-00233-TUC-CKJ

**PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE IN  
OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO  
REVISE DISCOVERY  
SCHEDULE PURSUANT TO  
RULE 54(b) (DOC. 121)**

Plaintiffs respectfully file this Response in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Revise Discovery Schedule Pursuant to Rule 54(b). (Doc. 121) For the reasons set forth below, the Court should deny Defendants' motion.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Defendants' purported "Motion to Revise Discovery Schedule Pursuant to Rule 54(b) (Doc. 121), is an improper attempt to modify the Case Management Scheduling

Order (“Scheduling Order”) (Doc. 102), based on grievances Defendants endorsed, if not actually proposed. Notwithstanding, Defendants now lodge wholly unsupported allegations against Plaintiffs and seek to rewrite the Court’s Scheduling Order in an apparent effort to delay the case, run up costs and frustrate Plaintiffs’ legitimate discovery efforts.

**A. The Scheduling Order**

As a multistate effort, Plaintiffs intentionally coordinated among “a small group of the Plaintiff states” their “pre-litigation investigative work and the preliminary analysis of the call detail records for the benefit of all Plaintiffs.” (Doc. 89 at 2, §II) Likewise, Plaintiffs share the same expert witnesses. (Doc. 89 at 2–3, §II) Plaintiffs explained “[t]he discovery relevant to the federal claims [...] will largely be the same for all Plaintiffs as to the Defendants’ business practices, conduct and knowledge or deliberate ignorance of the illegal robocalls at issue.” *Id.* This is the same for the state law counts, which can be supported by a violation of federal law or supported by the same or similar evidence. *Id.*

Notwithstanding the commonality of the claims among the Plaintiff states, both Plaintiffs and Defendants initially proposed competing case management plans that, among other things, modified the number of depositions per side under Rule 30. (Doc. 97 at 3, §III(B)) Plaintiffs proposed modifying the default number of depositions set forth in Rule 30 to permit 20 depositions per side. (Doc. 89 at 8, §IV(B)) Separately, Defendants proposed modifying the default number of depositions set forth in Rule 30 “to allow a total of 40 fact depositions[.]” (Doc. 95 at 14, §III(B)) Defendants reasoned their proposal allowed depositions of “[o]ne fact deposition of each Plaintiff that filed a separate claim under state law[.]” “[o]ne fact deposition of each member of the Plaintiff Lead Group[.]” and omitted all other Plaintiffs. (Doc. 95 at 15 §III(C)) Notably, Defendants requested no discovery modifications under Rules 33 or 34. (Doc. 95 at 13–15, §III(A), (C); Doc. 97 at 3–4, §III(A), (C))

After considering the parties’ proposals, the Court entered a Scheduling Order, which was generally consistent with the default limits set forth in Rules 30, 31, and 33.

(Doc. 102 at 2, ¶E(1)) The Court did expand the number of depositions for both sets of parties to (i) “Defendants,” (ii) “the lead Plaintiff States of Arizona, Indiana, North Carolina, and Ohio,”<sup>1</sup> (iii) “any Plaintiff state bringing state law actions[,]”<sup>2</sup> (iv) “respective experts[,]” and (v) “not more than ten non-party fact witness depositions per party.” *Id.* In other words, the Court granted the parties’ request to expand the number of depositions permitted by Rule 30 to the thirteen Plaintiff States Defendants requested, each party’s experts, and ten non-party fact witnesses. Cumulatively, the Scheduling Order provided Defendants *at least* twenty-three depositions, excluding expert witnesses, both parties have yet to disclose.

Since the Court issued the Scheduling Order, Defendants have issued consolidated requests for documents and requests for admissions to the four Lead Plaintiff States and State Law Plaintiffs. *See, e.g.*, (Doc. 116 at 2) Since July 25, 2025, Defendants have served an additional 630 Requests for Document Production and 39 Requests for Admissions to the Lead Plaintiffs and Plaintiff States with state law claims. But according to Defendants, they are improperly being limited in their ability to conduct discovery because they will not be permitted to separately depose each of the 49 Plaintiffs. Defendants justify their position by erroneously arguing that all 49 states are making discrete claims based on differing fact patterns. *See* (Doc. 121 at 5) (alleging the Scheduling Order “does not allow any discovery on thirty-six (36) of their co-Plaintiffs each of whom are presenting claims based on materially different facts”). Thus, contrary to Scheduling Order’s express

---

<sup>1</sup> Collectively, hereafter referred to as “Lead Plaintiff States.”

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs People of the State of California; Office of the Attorney General, State of Florida, Department of Legal Affairs; State of Indiana; Office of the Maryland Attorney General; State of Nevada; People of the State of New York, by Letitia James, Attorney General of the State of New York; State of North Carolina; State of North Dakota, *ex rel.* Drew H. Wrigley, Attorney General; State of Rhode Island; State of Washington; and State of Wisconsin (collectively, hereafter referred to as “State Law Plaintiffs”).

1 limitations, Defendants issued Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notices to all 36 non-lead, non-  
 2 state claims Plaintiffs.<sup>3</sup>

3 **B. An overview of Plaintiffs’ consolidated multistate complaint.**

4 The Plaintiffs, 49 states and commonwealths, have brought a consolidated  
 5 enforcement action with claims based on violations of federal telemarketing laws and rules,  
 6 including certain analogous state laws or rules, against the three Defendants. States’  
 7 attorneys general bringing multistate actions like this is *not* an uncommon occurrence in  
 8 federal court. States’ multistate coordination, often overseen by a small group of lead  
 9 states, is the norm for state attorneys general multistate actions. *See generally* Elysa M.  
 10 Dishman, *Class Action Squared: Multistate Actions and Agency Dilemmas*, 96 Notre Dame  
 11 L. Rev. 291, 301–09 (2020). While each state has the ability to prosecute its own case, in  
 12 a multistate action, designated lead states work collectively to resolve common claims  
 13 based on common facts on behalf of all states participating in the multistate action. These  
 14 lead states often collect and analyze early (or all) investigative data, coordinate among  
 15 participating states, delegate tasks to committees, and perform essential litigation  
 16 responsibilities. *See id.* The lead states function like class plaintiffs and, after a case is filed,  
 17 like a steering committee.

18 Each of the 49 sovereign Plaintiffs in this case has alleged the same operative facts,  
 19 namely that Defendants were, at all relevant times, in the business of providing Voice over  
 20 Internet Protocol (“VoIP”) services to initiate or facilitate illegal robocalls to every U.S.  
 21 state or territory. Plaintiffs’ common facts establish that the Defendants’ actions violated  
 22 the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (“Telemarketing Act”),  
 23 15 U.S.C. § 6101, *et seq.*; the Telemarketing Sales Rule (“TSR”), 16 C.F.R. § 310, *et seq.*;

---

24  
 25 <sup>3</sup> All Plaintiffs who improperly received Defendants’ Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notices  
 26 under the Scheduling Order objected in a timely manner. Yet, in their motion Defendants  
 27 assert “that 36 Plaintiff States have flatly refused to respond to any discovery requests.”  
 28 (Doc. 121 at 7 n.5) Defendants’ assertion is patently false. Defendants’ reporting of these  
 facts to the Court in a manner which characterizes those 36 Plaintiffs as being  
 uncooperative and refusing to comply with their discovery obligations under the Federal  
 Rules of Civil Procedure is disingenuous, inaccurate, and highly inappropriate.

1 the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et. seq.*; and the Truth  
2 in Caller ID Act (“TCIA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227(e). (Doc. 1 at ¶6)

3 A subset of sovereign Plaintiffs also raised claims arising under their respective state  
4 consumer protection laws, including state laws prohibiting unfair, deceptive, abusive, and  
5 illegal telemarketing practices. Many of the State Law Plaintiffs’ claims are derivative of  
6 the federal law violations. For example, Maryland’s claim for violations of the Maryland  
7 Telephone Consumer Protection Act, Md. Code. Ann., Com. Law § 14-3201, *et seq.*, makes  
8 it an unfair and deceptive practice to violate the Telemarketing Act and TCPA. (Doc. 1 at  
9 ¶¶493–509) Likewise, Florida’s claim for violations of the Florida Deceptive and Unfair  
10 Trade Practices Act, Fla. Stat. §§ 501.201, *et seq.*, is based on Defendants’ violation of the  
11 TSR. (*Id.* at ¶¶462–81) Notwithstanding the derivative nature of these claims, Plaintiffs  
12 have never objected to the Scheduling Order’s expansion of the number of depositions that  
13 may be taken under Rule 30 so that Defendants may depose all of the State Law Plaintiffs  
14 that have made separate claims under their state laws.

15 The factual allegations that support the state and federal claims alleged by Plaintiffs  
16 are common among all 49 states. They are generally that Defendants offered services in  
17 “every area code in the United States,” (*id.* at ¶38), and “provided substantial support and  
18 assisted sellers and telemarketers engaged in illegal robocalling” in each of “the Plaintiffs’  
19 respective jurisdictions[,]” (*Id.* at ¶46). Defendants also boasted its services would  
20 “[i]ncrease your sales with local callbacks for every state you dial[.]” (*id.* at ¶67); *see also*  
21 (*id.* at ¶ 57) (“Avid Telecom provides VoIP services in all of the Plaintiffs’ respective  
22 jurisdictions.”). In other words, the services Defendants provided were not unique to any  
23 Plaintiffs’ jurisdiction.

24 To support Plaintiffs’ common allegations, Plaintiffs conducted a preliminary  
25 analysis of Defendants’ call traffic across the United States. (*Id.* at ¶86–96) Plaintiffs’  
26 review, conducted by a core group of states with the assistance of one of the Plaintiffs’  
27 shared experts, showed Defendants transmitted more than 1 million illegal calls to  
28 consumers in each of Plaintiffs’ respective jurisdictions that were illegal and/or violative

1 of federal law. (*Id.* at ¶88(h)) Based on Plaintiffs’ preliminary analysis, Plaintiffs  
2 ascertained numeric state-specific examples of Defendants’ facilitation of unlawful calls  
3 nationwide, which are the only state-specific material facts alleged in Plaintiffs’  
4 consolidated action. (*Id.* at ¶89)

5 Plaintiffs’ jointly alleged federal claims against Defendants rely on no state-specific  
6 misconduct. (*Id.* at ¶¶426–58) The principal variable facts for Plaintiffs’ common federal  
7 claims are the quantity of illegal calls Defendants transmitted into each Plaintiffs’  
8 respective state. Likewise, and especially because State Law Plaintiffs’ claims are  
9 derivative of their federal claims, the principal variable facts for the Plaintiffs’ state law  
10 claims are again linked to the quantity of illegal calls. Put simply, the primary alleged facts  
11 that are specific to each Plaintiff are the number of violations committed in that state by  
12 the Defendants, but the factual support for those numeric violations is the *same* for each  
13 Plaintiff.

14 Defendants intrinsically endorse the fact that Plaintiffs’ claims only factually differ  
15 based on the quantity of illegal calls made in each state. Per Defendants’ own example, the  
16 only facts Defendants can identify as “unique” are “that Texas citizens received  
17 approximately eighty thousand (82,000) illegal calls[,]” *i.e.*, the quantity of illegal calls  
18 directed to each state. (Doc. 121 at 6) Plaintiffs’ complaint, however, is based on the same  
19 non-unique illegal conduct Defendants directed toward each Plaintiff’s respective state.  
20 Ultimately, Plaintiffs’ common facts and common claims illustrate that Defendants  
21 indiscriminately facilitated illegal or unlawful calls all across the U.S. irrespective of  
22 jurisdiction. Plaintiffs intend to provide further analyses of those calls on a per state basis  
23 through expert disclosures, based in part, on Defendants’ own records.

## II. ARGUMENT

### A. The commonality of the Plaintiffs’ multistate claims favors the existing consolidated discovery plan, which eliminates cumulative and wasteful discovery.

At the outset, Plaintiffs generally question Defendants’ true intention in filing their motion—it makes little sense for Defendants to spend the time and money to take 49 separate depositions of each Plaintiff that relied on a common investigation conducted by a smaller number of lead states. As is set forth below, this seems cumulative and wasteful. Notwithstanding the questionable nature of what Defendants may actually be seeking, the arguments they make in support of their motion rely on a factually incorrect mischaracterization of the Plaintiffs’ claims.

The Federal Rules generally disfavor duplicative and cumulative discovery, Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C), and judges have broad discretion to set limitations on party discovery. *Blackburn v. United States*, 100 F.3d 1426, 1436 (9th Cir. 1996). Although class actions are fundamentally different from sovereign multistate actions,<sup>4</sup> the legal principles guiding a district court’s reasons for limiting discovery in class actions can be illuminating.

District courts have routinely refused to impose individualized discovery for each plaintiff where the plaintiffs share claims based on common facts. *See, e.g., Scott v. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.*, 300 F.R.D. 188, 191 (S.D.N.Y. 2014) (rejecting individualized discovery for opt-in class where individualized discovery would not affect the common claims about the defendant’s misconduct); *Adkins v. Mid-American Growers, Inc.*, 143 F.R.D. 171, 174 (N.D. Ill. 1992) (noting “individualized discovery is not

---

<sup>4</sup> “The conceptual similarity between class actions and *parens patriae* actions is unavoidable[,]” but still very distinct. *Mississippi ex rel. Hood v. AU Optronics Corp.*, 876 F. Supp. 2d 758, 764 (S.D. Miss.), *rev’d and remanded*, 701 F.3d 796 (5th Cir. 2012), *rev’d and remanded*, 571 U.S. 161 (2014) (cleaned up). Generally, state attorneys general multistate actions (i) function more like a trustee capacity than a class representative capacity, (ii) have sovereign, quasi-sovereign and statutory standing considerations, and (iii) do not require class action procedural requirements, such as class certification, among other distinctions. *See id.*



1 appropriate under every circumstance,” specifically where individualized facts are not  
2 essential to the claims); *Weeks v. Matrix Absence Mgmt.*, 494 F. Supp. 3d 653, 659–60 (D.  
3 Ariz. 2020) (noting “individualized discovery of similarly situated plaintiffs is rarely  
4 appropriate”); *In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 327 F.R.D. 299, 311–14 (N.D. Cal.  
5 2018) (holding that “common questions” can be resolved for all plaintiffs when the facts  
6 present “no material differences [...] requir[ing] individualized adjudication”); *but see In*  
7 *re Varsity Spirit Athlete Abuse Litig.*, 677 F. Supp. 3d 1376, 1378 (J.P.M.L. 2023)  
8 (discussing unique factual issues were present, such as the variation of person committing  
9 misconduct, thus denying centralization). Courts have also rejected the argument that such  
10 a limitation violates due process. *Scott*, 300 F.R.D. at 191.

11 In the instant case, this Court’s Scheduling Order permits the Defendants to depose  
12 each Plaintiff that has made a separate state claim and the Lead Plaintiff States that  
13 conducted the multistate investigation, which avoids unnecessary, cumulative, and  
14 wasteful discovery and is consistent with the principles of Rule 26(b)(2)(C). Because  
15 Plaintiffs have brought this multistate action as a coordinated effort based on common legal  
16 claims and common operative facts, limiting depositions to the Lead Plaintiff States and  
17 State Law Plaintiffs, as the Court has done, facilitates efficient, non-duplicative, and  
18 non-prejudicial discovery.

19 The Scheduling Order in this case permits Defendants to serve paper discovery on  
20 all Plaintiffs and only limited Defendants’ ability to take unnecessary and cumulative  
21 deposition testimony. Defendants have not explained how such a limitation on oral  
22 testimony only prejudices them other than by baldly claiming they have been unfairly  
23 limited and grossly mischaracterizing the Plaintiffs’ Complaint. Defendants’ argument  
24 does not establish that this Court acted unreasonably—let alone abused its discretion—  
25 when setting the Scheduling Order.



**B. Defendants incorrectly rely on Rule 54(b).**

Defendants seek modification of the Scheduling Order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b), but the Scheduling Order does not constitute the final judgment required by Rule 54(b). Specifically, Rule 54(b) provides that a district “court may direct entry of a final judgment as to one or more, but fewer than all, claims or parties only if the court expressly determines that there is no just reason for delay.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); *Pakootas v. Teck Cominco Metals, Ltd.*, 905 F.3d 565, 574 (9th Cir. 2018) (“Rule 54(b) allows a district court in appropriate circumstances to enter judgment on one or more claims while others remain unadjudicated.”). In other words, “Rule 54(b) permits district courts to authorize immediate appeal of dispositive rulings on separate claims in a civil action raising multiple claims[.]” *Gelboim v. Bank of Am. Corp.*, 574 U.S. 405, 409 (2015).

The condition precedent for any relief under Rule 54(b) is that “the district court first must render ‘an ultimate disposition of an individual claim.’” *Pakootas*, 905 F.3d at 574 (quoting *Curtiss-Wright Corp. v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, 446 U.S. 1, 7 (1980)); *S.E.C. v. Cap. Consultants LLC*, 453 F.3d 1166, 1170–74 (9th Cir. 2006) (discussing that a party must seek an entry of judgment prior to or simultaneously with a Rule 54(b) motion). After the court renders final judgment, the “court then must find that there is no just reason for delaying judgment on [the] claim.” *Pakootas*, 905 F.3d at 574. Put differently, without final judgment on one or more claims, Rule 54(b) offers Defendants no relief.

Defendants seem to acknowledge this by noting, “[t]here has been no final judgment in the instant matter.” (Doc. 121 at 10) Yet, Defendants, undaunted, plow ahead by resting their entire argument on the latter half of Rule 54(b), which sets forth the “general rule” that a district court may revise any interlocutory order. *See City of Los Angeles, Harbor Div. v. Santa Monica BayKeeper*, 254 F.3d 882, 885 (9th Cir. 2001) (noting district court’s plenary power to modify non-final orders); *see also* 10 Charles A. Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2660 (4th ed. July 2025 update) (“The second sentence of the rule expressly states that any order failing to meet these requirements may

1 be revised at any time prior to the entry of a final judgment adjudicating the entire action.”).  
 2 Absent the condition precedent, however, Rule 54(b) offers the Defendants no relief.

3 Ultimately, Rule 54(b) is the improper avenue for Defendants to seek modification  
 4 of the Scheduling Order. The Court should accordingly deny Defendants’ motion.

5 **C. Defendants have not shown the good cause required to modify a**  
 6 **scheduling order under Rule 16(b)(4).**

7 Rule 16(b) is the proper vehicle for motions to amend a scheduling order. *See Kamal*  
 8 *v. Eden Creamery, LLC*, 88 F.4th 1268, 1277 (9th Cir. 2023) (“When a district court enters  
 9 a pretrial scheduling order..., as the court did here, a motion to amend is governed by Rule  
 10 16(b).”) (citations omitted). If the Court considers Defendants’ motion under Fed. R. Civ.  
 11 P. 16(b)(4), the Court should likewise deny Defendants’ motion. “The district court is given  
 12 broad discretion in supervising the pretrial phase of litigation,” which includes the number  
 13 and length of depositions. *Zivkovic v. S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 302 F.3d 1080, 1087 (9th Cir.  
 14 2002). A scheduling order “may be modified only for good cause and with the judge’s  
 15 consent.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). “If the party seeking the modification ‘was not diligent,  
 16 the inquiry should end’ and the motion to modify should not be granted.” *Id.* (quoting  
 17 *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 607–09 (9th Cir.1992)). The Ninth  
 18 Circuit regularly analyzes the timing of a movant’s request to modify a scheduling order  
 19 to assess that movant’s diligence. *See, e.g., Zivkovic*, 302 F.3d at 1087–88. Moreover, “the  
 20 focus of the inquiry is upon the moving party’s reasons for seeking modification.” *Johnson*,  
 21 975 F.2d at 609. A party’s “carelessness is not compatible with a finding of diligence and  
 22 offers no reason for a grant of relief.” *Id.*

23 Defendants’ motion does not establish the good cause necessary to support  
 24 Defendants’ request to modify the Scheduling Order. First, Defendants’ motion is based  
 25 on a misreading of the Scheduling Order. Defendants claim the plain language of the  
 26 Scheduling Order denies them “full and *substantively equal* discovery[,]” (Doc. 121 at 11)  
 27 (emphasis in original), but the Scheduling Order itself provides only that “party depositions  
 28 are limited[.]” (Doc. 102 at 2, § E(1)) Defendants are in fact being afforded “full and

1 substantively equal discovery” because all of Plaintiffs’ claims are based on largely the  
2 same evidence obtained from common sources. (Doc. 79 at 23)

3 Second, the deposition parameters are practically identical to Defendants’ proposal,  
4 and Defendants specifically asked for the Court to limit depositions to the thirteen Lead  
5 Plaintiff States and State Law Plaintiffs. (Doc. 95 at 15 §III(C)) As is set forth more fully  
6 above, the Defendants’ sole justification for modifying the Scheduling Order is a blatant  
7 mischaracterization of the Plaintiffs’ case, which involves one common set of facts—not  
8 49 distinct claims raised by each Plaintiff, as Defendants incorrectly argue. Other than  
9 mischaracterizing Plaintiffs’ Complaint, Defendants make no attempt to explain why a  
10 change is needed in the Scheduling Order. Defendants thus have failed to meet their burden  
11 to show good cause for modifying the Scheduling Order; therefore, the Court should also  
12 deny the motion under Rule 16(b)(4).

13 Finally, Defendants’ request to modify the Scheduling Order comes *more than*  
14 *seven months* after the Court issued the order, and a little more than three months before  
15 the close of discovery. Defendants’ apparent purposeful delay to request a modification of  
16 the Scheduling Order indicates a lack of diligence. *See Zivkovic*, 302 F.3d at 1087–88  
17 (finding the district court did not abuse its discretion because movant “did not demonstrate  
18 diligence” when “counsel did not seek to modify that order until four months after the court  
19 issued the [scheduling] order”). Defendants thus have failed to meet their burden to show  
20 good cause for modifying the Scheduling Order; therefore, the Court should also deny the  
21 motion under Rule 16(b)(4).

### 22 23 **III. CONCLUSION**

24 For the reasons articulated above, Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court deny  
25 Defendants’ motion. (Doc. 121)

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this the 14th day of August 2025.

2  
3 **FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA:**

4 KRISTIN K. MAYES  
5 Attorney General for the State of Arizona

6  
7 /s/ John Raymond Dillon IV  
8 JOHN RAYMOND DILLON IV  
9 SARAH PELTON  
10 DYLAN JONES  
11 LAURA DILWEG  
12 ALYSE MEISLIK  
Assistant Attorneys General  
*Attorneys for the State of Arizona*

**FOR THE STATE OF NORTH  
CAROLINA:**

JEFF JACKSON  
Attorney General for the State of North  
Carolina

/s/ Tracy Nayer  
TRACY NAYER  
ROCHELLE SPARKO  
Special Deputy Attorneys General  
*Attorneys for the State of North Carolina*

13  
14 **FOR THE STATE OF INDIANA:**

15 TODD ROKITA  
16 Attorney General for the State of Indiana

17 /s/ Douglas S. Swetnam  
18 DOUGLAS S. SWETNAM  
19 THOMAS L. MARTINDALE  
20 Deputy Attorneys General  
*Attorneys for the State of Indiana*

**FOR THE STATE OF OHIO:**

DAVE YOST  
Attorney General for the State of Ohio

/s/ Erin Leahy  
ERIN B. LEAHY  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
*Attorney for the State of Ohio*

21  
22 *Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs*  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on August 14, 2025, I caused the foregoing **PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO REVISE DISCOVERY SCHEDULE PURSUANT TO RULE 54(b) (DOC. 121)** to be filed and served electronically via the Court's CM/ECF system upon counsel of record.

/s/ Belen O. Miranda  
Belen O. Miranda

## LIST OF PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL

John Raymond Dillon IV (AZ Bar No. 036796)

Sarah Pelton (AZ Bar No. 039633)

Dylan Jones (AZ Bar No. 034185)

Laura Dilweg (AZ No. 036066)

Alyse Meislik (AZ No. 024052)

Assistant Attorneys General

Arizona Attorney General's Office

2005 North Central Avenue

Phoenix, AZ 85004

Phone: (602) 542-8018

Fax: (602) 542-4377

[john.dillonIV@azag.gov](mailto:john.dillonIV@azag.gov)

[sarah.pelton@azag.gov](mailto:sarah.pelton@azag.gov)

[mailto:dylan.jones@azag.gov](mailto:mailto:dylan.jones@azag.gov)

[laura.dilweg@azag.gov](mailto:laura.dilweg@azag.gov)

[alyse.meislik@azag.gov](mailto:alyse.meislik@azag.gov)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Arizona*

Douglas S. Swetnam (IN Bar No. 15860-49)

Thomas L. Martindale (IN Bar No. 29706-64)

Deputy Attorneys General

Office of the Indiana Attorney General

Todd Rokita

Indiana Govt. Center South, 5th Fl.

302 W. Washington St.

Indianapolis, IN 46204-2770

Phone: (317) 232-6294 (Swetnam)

(317) 232-7751 (Martindale)

Fax: (317) 232-7979

[douglas.swetnam@atg.in.gov](mailto:douglas.swetnam@atg.in.gov)

[thomas.martindale@atg.in.gov](mailto:thomas.martindale@atg.in.gov)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Indiana*

Tracy Nayer (NC Bar No. 36964)

Rochelle Sparko (NC Bar No. 38528)

Special Deputy Attorneys General

North Carolina Department of Justice

Consumer Protection Division

P.O. Box 629

Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Phone: (919) 716-6000

Fax: (919) 716-6050

[tnayer@ncdoj.gov](mailto:tnayer@ncdoj.gov)

[rsparko@ncdoj.gov](mailto:rsparko@ncdoj.gov)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of North Carolina*

Erin B. Leahy (OH Bar No. 0069509)

Senior Assistant Attorney General

Office of Attorney General Dave Yost

30 East Broad Street, 14th Fl.

Columbus, OH 43215

Phone: (614) 752-4730

[Erin.Leahy@OhioAGO.gov](mailto:Erin.Leahy@OhioAGO.gov)

*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Ohio*

***Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs***

Lindsay D. Barton (AL Bar No. 1165-G00N)  
 Robert D. Tambling (AL Bar No. 6026-N67R)  
 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Office of the Alabama Attorney General  
 501 Washington Avenue  
 Montgomery, Alabama 36130  
 Phone: (334) 353-2609 (Barton)  
 (334) 242-7445 (Tambling)  
 Fax: (334) 353-8400  
[Lindsay.Barton@AlabamaAG.gov](mailto:Lindsay.Barton@AlabamaAG.gov)  
[Robert.Tambling@AlabamaAG.gov](mailto:Robert.Tambling@AlabamaAG.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Alabama*

Amanda Wentz (AR Bar No. 2021066)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of Attorney General Tim Griffin  
 101 West Capitol Avenue  
 Little Rock, AR 72201  
 Phone: (501) 682-1178  
 Fax: (501) 682-8118  
[amanda.wentz@arkansasag.gov](mailto:amanda.wentz@arkansasag.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Arkansas*

Nicklas A. Akers (CA Bar No. 211222)  
 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 Bernard A. Eskandari (CA Bar No. 244395)  
 Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
 Timothy D. Lundgren (CA Bar No. 254596)  
 Rosailda Perez (CA Bar No. 284646)  
 Deputy Attorneys General  
 Office of the California Attorney General  
 300 S. Spring St., Suite 1702  
 Los Angeles, CA 90013  
 Phone: (415) 510-3364 (Akers)  
 (213) 269-6348 (Eskandari)  
 (213) 269-6355 (Lundgren)  
 (213) 269-6612 (Perez)  
 Fax: (916) 731-2146  
[nicklas.akers@doj.ca.gov](mailto:nicklas.akers@doj.ca.gov)  
[bernard.eskandari@doj.ca.gov](mailto:bernard.eskandari@doj.ca.gov)  
[timothy.lundgren@doj.ca.gov](mailto:timothy.lundgren@doj.ca.gov)  
[rosailda.perez@doj.ca.gov](mailto:rosailda.perez@doj.ca.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State of California*

Michel Singer Nelson (CO Bar No. 19779)  
 Assistant Attorney General II  
 Colorado Office of the Attorney General  
 Ralph L. Carr Judicial Building  
 1300 Broadway, 10th Floor  
 Denver, CO 80203  
 Phone: (720) 508-6220  
[michel.singernelson@coag.gov](mailto:michel.singernelson@coag.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Colorado,  
 ex rel. Philip J. Weiser, Attorney General*



1 Brendan T. Flynn (Fed. Bar No. ct04545,  
 2 CT Bar No. 419935)  
 3 Assistant Attorney General  
 4 Office of the Connecticut Attorney  
 5 General William Tong  
 6 165 Capitol Avenue, Suite 4000  
 7 Hartford, CT 06106  
 8 Phone: (860) 808-5400  
 9 Fax: (860) 808-5593  
 10 <mailto:brendan.flynn@ct.gov>  
 11 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Connecticut*

12 Ryan Costa (DE Bar No. 5325)  
 13 Deputy Attorney General  
 14 Delaware Department of Justice  
 15 820 N. French Street, 5th Floor  
 16 Wilmington, DE 19801  
 17 Phone: (302) 683-8811  
 18 Fax: (302) 577-6499  
 19 [Ryan.costa@delaware.gov](mailto:Ryan.costa@delaware.gov)  
 20 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Delaware*

21 Laura C. Beckerman (DC Bar No.  
 22 1008120)  
 23 Senior Trial Counsel  
 24 Public Advocacy Division  
 25 D.C. Office of the Attorney General  
 26 400 6th Street NW, 10th Floor  
 27 Washington, DC 20001  
 28 Phone: (202) 655-7906  
[Laura.Beckerman@dc.gov](mailto:Laura.Beckerman@dc.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff District of Columbia*

Miles Vaughn (FL Bar No. 1032235)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Florida Attorney General  
 Consumer Protection Division  
 3507 E. Frontage Rd, Suite 325  
 Tampa, FL 33607  
 Phone: (813) 287-7950  
 Fax: (813) 281-5515  
[miles.vaughn@myfloridalegal.com](mailto:miles.vaughn@myfloridalegal.com)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff James Uthmeier,  
 Attorney General of the State of Florida*

David A. Zisook (GA Bar No. 310104)  
 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Georgia Attorney General  
 40 Capitol Square SW  
 Atlanta, GA 30334  
 Phone: (404) 458-4294  
 Fax: (404) 464-8212  
[dzisook@law.ga.gov](mailto:dzisook@law.ga.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Georgia*

Christopher J.I. Leong (HI Bar No. 9662)  
 Deputy Attorney General  
 Hawaii Department of the Attorney  
 General  
 425 Queen Street  
 Honolulu, HI 96813  
 Phone: (808) 586-1180  
 Fax: (808) 586-1205  
[christopher.ji.leong@hawaii.gov](mailto:christopher.ji.leong@hawaii.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Hawaii*

James J. Simeri (ID Bar No. 12332)  
 Consumer Protection Division Chief  
 Idaho Attorney General's Office  
 P.O. Box 83720  
 Boise, ID 83720-0010  
 Phone: (208) 334-4114  
[james.simeri@ag.idaho.gov](mailto:james.simeri@ag.idaho.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Idaho*

Philip Heimlich (IL Bar No. 6286375)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Elizabeth Blackston (IL Bar No. 6228859)  
 Consumer Fraud Bureau Chief  
 Office of the Illinois Attorney General  
 500 S. Second Street  
 Springfield, IL 62791  
 Phone: (217) 782-4436  
[philip.heimlich@ilag.gov](mailto:philip.heimlich@ilag.gov)  
[elizabeth.blackston@ilag.gov](mailto:elizabeth.blackston@ilag.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State of Illinois*

Benjamin Bellus (IA Bar No. AT0000688)  
 William Pearson (IA Bar No. AT0012070)  
 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Office of the Iowa Attorney General  
 1305 E. Walnut St.  
 Des Moines, IA 50319  
 Phone: (515) 242-6536 (Bellus)  
 (515) 242-6773 (Pearson)  
 Fax: (515) 281-6771  
[Benjamin.Bellus@ag.iowa.gov](mailto:Benjamin.Bellus@ag.iowa.gov)  
[William.Pearson@ag.iowa.gov](mailto:William.Pearson@ag.iowa.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Iowa*

Nicholas C. Smith (KS Bar No. 29742)  
 Sarah M. Dietz (KS Bar No. 27457)  
 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Consumer Protection Section  
 Office of the Kansas Attorney General  
 120 SW 10th Avenue, 2nd Floor  
 Topeka, KS 66612  
 Phone: (785) 296-3751  
 Fax: (785) 291-3699  
[Nicholas.Smith@ag.ks.gov](mailto:Nicholas.Smith@ag.ks.gov)  
[sarah.dietz@ag.ks.gov](mailto:sarah.dietz@ag.ks.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Kansas*

Jacob P. Ford (KY Bar No. 95546)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Attorney General,  
 Commonwealth of Kentucky  
 1024 Capital Center Drive, Ste. 200  
 Frankfort, KY 40601  
 Phone: (502) 871-2044  
[jacobp.ford@ky.gov](mailto:jacobp.ford@ky.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Commonwealth of Kentucky*

ZaTabia N. Williams (LA Bar No. 36933)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Attorney General Liz Murrill  
 1885 North Third St.  
 Baton Rouge, LA 70802  
 Phone: (225) 326-6164  
 Fax: (225) 326-6499  
[WilliamsZ@ag.louisiana.gov](mailto:WilliamsZ@ag.louisiana.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Louisiana*

Brendan O'Neil (ME Bar No. 009900)  
 Michael Devine (ME Bar No. 005048)  
 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Office of the Maine Attorney General  
 6 State House Station  
 Augusta, ME 04333  
 Phone: (207) 626-8800  
 Fax: (207) 624-7730  
[brendan.oneil@maine.gov](mailto:brendan.oneil@maine.gov)  
[michael.devine@maine.gov](mailto:michael.devine@maine.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Maine*

Philip Ziperman (Fed. Bar No. 12430)  
 Deputy Counsel  
 Office of the Attorney General  
 200 St. Paul Place  
 Baltimore, MD 21202  
 Phone: (410) 576-6417  
 Fax: (410) 576-6566  
[pziperman@oag.state.md.us](mailto:pziperman@oag.state.md.us)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Maryland Office of the Attorney General*

1 Carol Guerrero (MA Bar No. 705419)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 2 Michael N. Turi (MA Bar No. 706205)  
 Deputy Chief, Consumer Protection  
 3 Division  
 Massachusetts Office of the Attorney  
 4 General  
 One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor  
 5 Boston, MA 02108  
 Phone: (617) 963-2783  
 6 Fax: (617) 727-5765  
 7 <mailto:Carol.Guerrero@mass.gov>  
 8 [Michael.Turi@mass.gov](mailto:Michael.Turi@mass.gov)  
 9 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Commonwealth of*  
 10 *Massachusetts*

11 Kathy P. Fitzgerald (MI Bar No. P31454)  
 Michael S. Hill (MI Bar No. P73084)  
 12 Assistant Attorneys General  
 Michigan Department of Attorney General  
 13 Corporate Oversight Division  
 P.O. Box 30736  
 14 Lansing, MI 48909  
 Phone: (517) 335-7632  
 15 Fax: (517) 335-6755  
 16 [fitzgeraldk@michigan.gov](mailto:fitzgeraldk@michigan.gov)  
 17 [Hillm19@michigan.gov](mailto:Hillm19@michigan.gov)  
 18 *Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the*  
 19 *State of Michigan*

20 Bennett Hartz (MN Bar No. 0393136)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 21 Office of the Minnesota Attorney General  
 22 445 Minnesota Street, Suite 1200  
 Saint Paul, MN 55404  
 23 Phone: (651) 757-1235  
 24 [bennett.hartz@ag.state.mn.us](mailto:bennett.hartz@ag.state.mn.us)  
 25 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Minnesota,*  
 26 *by its Attorney General, Keith Ellison*

James M. Rankin (MS Bar No. 102332)  
 Special Assistant Attorney General  
 Mississippi Attorney General's Office  
 P.O. Box 220  
 Jackson, MS 39205  
 Phone: (601) 359-4258  
[james.rankin@ago.ms.gov](mailto:james.rankin@ago.ms.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Lynn Fitch,*  
*Attorney General State of Mississippi*

Luke Hawley (MO Bar No. 73749)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Missouri Attorney General  
 815 Olive Street, Suite 200  
 St. Louis, MO 63101  
 Phone: (314) 340-6816  
 Fax: (314) 340-7891  
[luke.hawley@ago.mo.gov](mailto:luke.hawley@ago.mo.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Missouri, ex.*  
*rel. Andrew Bailey, Attorney General*

Brent Mead (MT Bar No. 68035000)  
 Deputy Solicitor General  
 Anna Schneider (MT Bar No. 13963)  
 Special Assistant Attorney General, Senior  
 Counsel  
 Montana Attorney General's Office  
 Office of Consumer Protection  
 215 North Sanders Street  
 P.O. Box 200151  
 Helena, MT 59620-0151  
 Phone: (406) 444-4500  
[Brent.mead2@mt.gov](mailto:Brent.mead2@mt.gov)  
[Anna.schneider@mt.gov](mailto:Anna.schneider@mt.gov)  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Montana*

1 Gary E. Brollier (NE Bar No. 19785)  
 2 Assistant Attorney General  
 3 Office of the Attorney General Michael T.  
 4 Hilgers  
 5 2115 State Capitol Building  
 6 Consumer Protection Division  
 7 Lincoln, NE 68509  
 8 Phone: (402) 471-1279  
 9 Fax: (402) 471-4725  
 10 [gary.brollier@nebraska.gov](mailto:gary.brollier@nebraska.gov)  
 11 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Nebraska*

12 Michelle C. Badorine (NV Bar No. 13206)  
 13 Senior Deputy Attorney General  
 14 Office of the Nevada Attorney General  
 15 Bureau of Consumer Protection  
 16 100 North Carson Street  
 17 Carson City, NV 89701-4717  
 18 Phone: (775) 684-1164  
 19 Fax: (775) 684-1299  
 20 [MBadorine@ag.nv.gov](mailto:MBadorine@ag.nv.gov)  
 21 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Nevada*

22 Mary F. Stewart (NH Bar No. 10067)  
 23 Assistant Attorney General  
 24 New Hampshire Department of Justice  
 25 Office of the Attorney General  
 26 Consumer Protection and Antitrust Bureau  
 27 1 Granite Place South  
 28 Concord, NH 03301  
 Phone: (603) 271-1139  
[Mary.F.Stewart@doj.nh.gov](mailto:Mary.F.Stewart@doj.nh.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of New Hampshire*

Jeffrey Koziar (NJ Bar No. 015131999)  
 Deputy Attorney General  
 New Jersey Office of the Attorney General  
 Division of Law  
 124 Halsey Street  
 Newark, NJ 07101  
 Phone: (973) 648-7819  
 Fax: (973) 648-4887  
<mailto:Jeff.koziar@law.njoag.gov>  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of New Jersey*

Billy Jimenez (NM Bar No. 144627)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 New Mexico Department of Justice  
 408 Galisteo St.  
 Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501  
 Phone: (505) 527-2694  
 Fax: (505) 490-4883  
[Bjimenez@nmdoj.gov](mailto:Bjimenez@nmdoj.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Raúl Torrez, New Mexico Attorney General*

Glenna Goldis (NY Bar No. 4868600)  
 Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the New York State Attorney  
 General  
 28 Liberty Street  
 New York, NY 10005  
 Phone: (646) 856-3697  
[Glenna.goldis@ag.ny.gov](mailto:Glenna.goldis@ag.ny.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Office of the Attorney General of the State of New York*

1 Elin S. Alm (ND Bar No. 05924)  
 2 Christopher Glenn Lindblad (ND Bar  
 3 No. 06480)  
 4 Assistant Attorneys General  
 5 Office of North Dakota Attorney General  
 6 Consumer Protection & Antitrust Division  
 7 1720 Burlington Drive, Suite C  
 8 Bismarck, ND 58504-7736  
 9 Phone: (701) 328-5570  
 10 Fax: (701) 328-5568  
 11 <mailto:ealm@nd.gov>  
 12 [clindblad@nd.gov](mailto:clindblad@nd.gov)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of North  
 Dakota*

10 Stephanie Powers (OK Bar No. 22892)  
 11 Assistant Attorney General  
 12 Office of the Oklahoma Attorney General  
 13 313 N.E. 21st St.  
 14 Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
 15 Phone: (405) 522-3412  
 16 Fax: (405) 522-0085  
 17 [Stephanie.Powers@oag.ok.gov](mailto:Stephanie.Powers@oag.ok.gov)  
 18 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Oklahoma ex  
 rel. Attorney General Gentner Drummond*

18 Jordan M. Roberts (OR Bar No. 115010)  
 19 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 20 Oregon Department of Justice  
 21 Consumer Protection Division  
 22 100 SW Market St.  
 23 Portland, OR 97201  
 24 Phone: (971) 673-1880  
 25 Fax: (971) 673-1884  
 26 [jordan.m.roberts@doj.oregon.gov](mailto:jordan.m.roberts@doj.oregon.gov)  
 27 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Oregon*

Mark W Wolfe (PA Bar No. 327807)  
 Deputy Attorney General  
 Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General  
 Strawberry Square, 15th Floor  
 Harrisburg, PA 17120-0001  
 Phone: (717) 772-3558  
 Fax: (717) 705-3795  
[mwolfe@attorneygeneral.gov](mailto:mwolfe@attorneygeneral.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Commonwealth of  
 Pennsylvania by Attorney General David  
 W. Sunday, Jr.*

Stephen N. Provazza (RI Bar No. 10435)  
 Special Assistant Attorney General  
 Rhode Island Office of the Attorney  
 General  
 150 S. Main Street  
 Providence, RI 02903  
 Phone: (401) 274-4400, ext. 2476  
 Fax: (401) 222-1766  
[sprovazza@riag.ri.gov](mailto:sprovazza@riag.ri.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Rhode  
 Island, by Attorney General Peter  
 Neronha*

Kristin Simons (SC Bar No. 74004)  
 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 South Carolina Attorney General's Office  
 P.O. Box 11549  
 Columbia, SC 29211-1549  
 Phone: (803) 734-6134  
[mailto:ksimons@scag.gov](mailto:mailto:ksimons@scag.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of South  
 Carolina*

1 Austin C. Ostiguy (TN Bar No. 040301)  
 2 Tyler T. Corcoran (TN Bar No. 038887)  
 3 Assistant Attorneys General  
 4 Office of the Tennessee Attorney General  
 5 P.O. Box 20207  
 6 Nashville, TN 37202  
 7 Phone: (615) 532-7271 (Ostiguy)  
 8 (615) 770-1714 (Corcoran)  
 9 Fax: (615) 532-2910

10 [austin.ostiguy@ag.tn.gov](mailto:austin.ostiguy@ag.tn.gov)  
 11 [tyler.corcoran@ag.tn.gov](mailto:tyler.corcoran@ag.tn.gov)

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Tennessee*

13 David Shatto (Fed. Bar No. 3725697; TX  
 14 Bar No. 24104114)  
 15 Assistant Attorney General  
 16 Attorney General for the State of Texas  
 17 Office of the Attorney General  
 18 P.O. Box 12548 (MC-010)  
 19 Austin, TX 78711  
 20 Phone: (512) 463-2185  
 21 Fax: (512) 473-9125

22 [David.Shatto@oag.texas.gov](mailto:David.Shatto@oag.texas.gov)

23 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of Texas*

24 Alexandra Butler (UT Bar No. 19238)  
 25 Assistant Attorney General  
 26 Utah Attorney General's Office  
 27 160 East 300 South, 5th Floor  
 28 P.O. Box 140872  
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872  
 Phone: (385) 910-5533  
 Fax: (801) 366-0315

[alexandrabutler@agutah.gov](mailto:alexandrabutler@agutah.gov)

*Attorney for Plaintiff Utah Division of  
 Consumer Protection*

James Layman (VT Bar No. 5236)  
 Office of the Vermont Attorney General  
 109 State Street  
 Montpelier, VT 05609-1001  
 Phone: (802) 828-2315  
 Fax: (802) 304-1014

[James.Layman@vermont.gov](mailto:James.Layman@vermont.gov)

*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Vermont*

Geoffrey L. Ward (VA Bar No. 89818)  
 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
 Office of the Attorney General of Virginia  
 202 N. Ninth St.

Richmond, VA 23219

Phone: (804) 371-0871

Fax: (804) 786-0122

[gward@oag.state.va.us](mailto:gward@oag.state.va.us)

*Attorney for Plaintiff Commonwealth of  
 Virginia, ex rel. Jason S. Miyares,  
 Attorney General*

Zorba Leslie (WA Bar No. 58523)

Assistant Attorney General

Washington State Attorney General's  
 Office

800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000

Seattle, WA 98104

Phone: (206) 340-6787

Fax: (206) 464-6451

[zorba.leslie@atg.wa.gov](mailto:zorba.leslie@atg.wa.gov)

*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Washington*



1 Ashley T. Wentz (WV Bar No. 13486)  
2 Assistant Attorney General  
3 West Virginia Attorney General's Office  
4 Consumer Protection/Antitrust Division  
5 P.O. Box 1789  
6 Charleston, WV 25326  
7 Phone: (304) 558-8986  
8 Fax: (304) 558-0184  
9 [Ashley.T.Wentz@wvago.gov](mailto:Ashley.T.Wentz@wvago.gov)  
10 *Attorney for Plaintiff State of West*  
11 *Virginia ex rel. John B. McCuskey,*  
12 *Attorney General*

Gregory A. Myszkowski (WI Bar No.  
1050022)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 7857  
Madison, WI 53707-7857  
Phone: (608) 266-7656  
Fax: (608) 294-2907  
[gregory.myszkowski@wisdoj.gov](mailto:gregory.myszkowski@wisdoj.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Wisconsin*

Cameron W. Geeting (WY Bar No.  
7-5338)  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection and Antitrust Unit  
Wyoming Office of the Attorney General  
2320 Capitol Avenue  
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002  
Phone: (307) 777-3795  
[cameron.geeting1@wyo.gov](mailto:cameron.geeting1@wyo.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Wyoming*



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**  
8

9 State of Arizona, *ex rel.* Kristin K. Mayes,  
10 Attorney General; *et al.*,

11 Plaintiffs;

12 v.  
13

14 Michael D. Lansky, L.L.C., dba Avid Telecom;  
15 *et al.*,

16 Defendants.  
17

No. CV-23-00233-TUC-CKJ

**[proposed] ORDER**

18  
19 Before the Court is Defendants' Motion to Revise the Discovery Schedule Pursuant  
20 to Rule 54(b). (Doc. 121) Having considered the motion and the responsive pleadings,  
21 Defendants failed to show good cause to expand the scope of discovery of the Case  
22 Management Scheduling Order. (Doc. 102)  
23

24 **Accordingly**, Defendants' Motion is **DENIED**.  
25  
26  
27  
28